R9372-2P
9/86

Refugee Reports

A Project of the American Council for Nationalities Service
815 Fifteenth Street NW, Suite 610 Washington, DC 20005 (202) 667-0782

Volume VII, Number 1 January 24, 1986

VIETNAM SUSPENDS ODP INTERVIEWING

Legal emigration from Vietnam was thrown into uncertainty as the Vietnamese government suspended interviewing under the Orderly Departure Program (ODP) as of January 1.

The suspension is the first to hit the program, which began under the aegis of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in 1979 and is the sole means of exit for people who wish to leave Vietnam legally. The stoppage reflects Vietnamese government dissatisfaction with an ODP backlog which, according to Vietnam, involves 60,000 people who should have already left for the United States, the leading recipient of ODP emigres.

Apparently, each of those individuals has been granted an exit visa by Vietnam, but only one-third of them have entered the ODP processing pipeline. Those who have entered are in various stages of being screened. The fact that, aside from obtaining exit visas from Vietnamese authorities, relatively few have been fully processed, or even entered processing, tempers Vietnam's claim of a backlog, according to U.S. officials. "There are several thousand people that still require documentation," commented Donald Ellson, who heads the ODP branch of the Bureau for Refugee Programs at the State Department.

Vietnam Blames ODP Backlog on U.S. The receiving countries generally have tightened their approaches to accepting people under ODP in recent years. To the displeasure of the Vietnamese government, people are rejected in instances where they don't fit the countries' national immigration priorities. According to Nguyen Dang Quang, Vietnam's First Secretary to the United Nations, the United States is responsible for the backlog that led to the suspension. The backlog, he said, "must go before there is another list."

The remark referred to the manner in which ODP applicants move through processing. Initially, that movement is controlled by the Vietnamese, who present lists of persons eligible for ODP departure to UNHCR interviewers in Ho Chi Minh City. The results of subsequent interviews of persons interested in going to the United States are forwarded to and ruled upon

IN THIS ISSUE:

The Vietnamese government has temporarily suspended further Orderly Departure Program interviewing. This month's feature looks at the reasons for the suspension and the prospects for the future of ODP.....1

- Update.....3
- Recent Developments

Gramm-Rudman law to affect refugee admissions and services; Would-be Romanian emigrants face difficulties; Arizona sanctuary trial moves slowly; Proposed bilingual-education regulations fuel controversy.....5

- Meetings and Conferences
- Resources.....15
- Statistics

Indochinese Refugee Activity, FY 86 as of November 30, 1985.....16

by consular officers with the American embassy in Bangkok.

More than 100,000 people have left Vietnam via ODP so far; more than 40 percent of them have arrived in the United States. Canada and Australia are also top receiving countries. Waits of years face those seeking to leave, and the waiting isn't easy. Once a person is granted an exit visa by Vietnam, he usually surrenders his employment and property. According to Nguyen, about half of the people in the backlog that Vietnam says it is concerned about are living in the streets of Ho Chi Minh City, while the remainder have returned to their towns and villages.

ODP Departures by Air Continue, but Future Unclear In the wake of Vietnamese action, a big question has been what would be the immediate effect on emigration. Reportedly, Air France flights were continuing to take cleared emigres from Ho Chi Minh City to Bangkok. According to State Department officials, the number of people who have cleared all processing and simply have to board flights in order to leave was approximately 2,300 in mid-January. That number could fill planes for "a couple of weeks" according to Ellson. "After that, we'll have to see," he said.

However, an international diplomatic source who tracks ODP closely took another view. The source indicated that there are enough people still in various stages of processing by the United States that it is at least conceivable that U.S.-bound departures could continue to leave for as long as one year. But the source added cautiously that "things are not often as simple as that. The number [who eventually leave] might be far fewer, depending on whether their files are able to be completed."

U.S., Vietnamese Contributions to Problem Noted At a superficial level, the current disruption of ODP may appear to be a matter of bureaucratic failure. According to one former interviewer who recently spent a year with the program in Ho Chi Minh City, responsibility rests partly with the Vietnamese because they didn't gauge the rate of their issuance of exit permits--the first thing individuals must obtain before they can leave Vietnam via ODP--to the speed of U.S. processing.

On the other hand, this source said, the United States has regularly had in its files a high number of persons whose cases are listed as "Pending Consular Review," but which are actually going unreviewed because there aren't enough consular and Joint Voluntary Agency staff to keep up with the program workload.

According to a cable that was sent last October by the U.S. embassy to UNHCR's ODP office in Ho Chi Minh City, nearly 6,000 people were in that classification as of September 1985.

Mutual Interest a Goal Unrealized Whatever the size and nature of the administrative snafus, however, they seem overshadowed by a more fundamental problem. From the start, the United States has based its participation in ODP on the principle of "reciprocity". That tenet holds that ODP

In the first three months of FY 86, October 1 through December 31, 1985, 2,273 Vietnamese who left Vietnam under the Orderly Departure Program (ODP) arrived in the United States. As of December 31, there were 4,167 ODP refugees in the refugee processing center (RPC) in Bataan, the Philippines, all of whom are likely to enter the United States during FY 86. More than 2,000 refugees and nonrefugees, whose ODP processing was complete and who were ready for flights, remained in Vietnam in January. If flights continue to take ODP participants from Vietnam, it is likely that at least half of the 2,000 will be refugees destined for the RPC in Bataan and eventual U.S. resettlement by the end of the fiscal year.

The ODP refugee admission ceiling for FY 86 is 8,500. Even if ODP processing is not resumed, there could be about 7,500 ODP refugee arrivals in the United States by the end of FY 86 if those now in the RPC and the 1,000 or so likely still to depart Vietnam are added to those who have already arrived. However, if this occurs and if processing is not resumed, no ODP refugees would be left in the pipeline for U.S. resettlement by the beginning of FY 87.

departures should reflect Vietnamese and American interests equally. However, such has rarely, if ever, been the case, as the Vietnamese primarily have used the program to send out ethnic Chinese, a population Vietnam doesn't want. In the spring of 1984, embassy staff were reporting that less than 10 percent of ODP departures were persons of interest to the United States. (See Refugee Reports, Vol. VI, No. 7 & 8).

In its September 1985 World Refugee Report, the State Department referred to the failure of reciprocity to take hold. "The United States will continue to press Hanoi to include in the [ODP] program an increasing number of persons of particular interest to us," the report stated. "Our goal is to reach complete reciprocity...with at least half of the departures coming from groups of special interest to the United States."

U.S. Initiatives on Amerasians, Re-ed Prisoners Fall Short Currently, the following are among those groups: certain relatives of U.S. residents; former South Vietnamese military and government officials; former employees of the United States; reeducation prisoners; and Amerasians--the children of U.S. servicemen and Americans once in Vietnam--and their Vietnamese partners.

To highlight the plight of the last two groups, the Reagan administration established two subprograms within its ODP ceiling for the 1985 fiscal year. Both fell short of their goals.

Vietnam presented approximately 1,000 fewer Amerasians and their relatives than could have been absorbed under the U.S. ceiling of 5,000; only a handful of persons who had served time in reeducation and had already been granted exit visas were allowed to leave. In the fall of 1984, Secretary of State George Shultz said that the United States was prepared to take as many as 10,000 prisoners over a two-year period. In FY 85, 3,823 Amerasians and accompanying relatives and 267 reeducation or former reeducation prisoners and accompanying relatives left Vietnam through the ODP program.

General Desire for ODP to Work Shared Though divided on the reciprocity issue, Vietnam and the United States are seen as wanting ODP to work. "It's not to their advantage to stop the program," the diplomatic source commented about the Vietnamese. A prolonged suspension could lead to a "whole series of problems" for Vietnam, she speculated, including an upsurge in boat people, each of whom represents "a criticism of the government."

An opportunity to rid itself of unwanted populations and a desire for improved relations with the United States have been reasons cited before by others for Vietnamese interest in ODP. Meanwhile, the United States has been clear about wanting ODP to work. "The ODP provides a safe, legal means of departure from Vietnam as an alternative to the dangerous and disorderly escape in small boats," the State Department noted in its September report.

Despite these basic positions, the aftershock of the suspension has lingered through much of January. All ODP interviewers left Ho Chi Minh City by January 17, according to the State Department. Meanwhile, a meeting among UNHCR, Vietnamese and U.S. "technical-level" officials was proposed for January 27 in Bangkok. The outcome of such a meeting could have a far-reaching effect. At the start of 1986, the names of more than 600,000 persons were in the embassy ODP application file.

This article was written by Joseph Cerquone.

Update

° On December 19, 30 Vietnamese boat people, all but two of them women and children, landed on the coast of Malaysia. They were survivors of an attack in the South China Sea by pirates who killed 50 of the refugees, the men over the age of 17, by throwing them into the sea. According to the UNHCR report of the attack, the pirates raped the women before leaving. One of the Vietnamese men survived by clinging to a floating can, reboarded the boat, and helped sail it to Malaysia. Another was picked up by a Malaysian fishing boat and taken to Malaysia. UNHCR officials called it the worst pirate attack in 1985.

On January 16, a boat with 27 Vietnamese refugees arrived in Malaysia and reported being attacked four times two days earlier. The attackers robbed the refugees, raped several women, and abducted three women, according to a UNHCR report. Another

refugee boat was attacked on January 18 by a vessel identified as Thai. In this incident, four women were raped and seven men forced into the sea, but there were no abductions or deaths, as the men were able to reboard their boat after the attackers left. The 48 refugees reached an oil rig in Malaysian waters the next day and were transported to Pulau Bidong refugee camp.

° A mercy mission to rescue and assist boat people in the Gulf of Thailand this May is being planned by the French nonprofit organization, Medecins du Monde (MDM). In the United States, support for MDM's plan, which would be their fourth such undertaking, is being coordinated by S.O.S. Boat People, a San Diego-based anti-piracy organization.

MDM operated mercy missions in the Gulf of Thailand in 1979, 1981, and, most recently, May 1985, when it rescued 520 people. An S.O.S. Boat People representative, Phan Lac Thiep, emphasized at a January Vietnamese community meeting in northern Virginia that his group will be trying to raise funds from the American public to support MDM's work. They will also work to educate U.S. government officials on the need to make available 300 of the 1,200 admissions slots they are seeking worldwide for those who may be rescued.

° The population of Site 2, a border camp in Thailand for Cambodians displaced from their settlements inside Cambodia by the Vietnamese offensive a year ago, now stands at nearly 135,000. Interviewing of the more than 4,000 land Vietnamese at Site 2, which had been awaiting Thai government approval, is expected to begin this month. The United States and other resettlement countries will consider those of the Vietnamese who are within categories of eligibility established by each country. Only those within processing priorities one through five will be interviewed by the United States, and it is estimated that no more than 800 people will be affected.

In a January 15 New York Times article, Barbara Crossette reported that 191 Montagnards from Vietnam who arrived in Thailand in 1985 were moved to Site 2 at the end of the year. The Montagnards, mountain people from Vietnam's central highlands, were recruited by the United States to fight Communist forces during the Vietnam War. After the United States withdrew, Crossette reports, the Montagnards continued fighting the Vietnamese army until 1979 when, their struggle clearly hopeless, many of them sought help from the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. But they were not welcomed by the Khmer Rouge and were treated, they said, almost as prisoners until they escaped during the Vietnamese offensive in 1985, which overran Khmer Rouge camps along the border with Thailand. Despite the Montagnards' ties to the United States, Crossette reported, refugee officials believe that many may not qualify for refugee admission to the United States because they are too young to have fought with U.S. forces. But, according to Crossette, the Montagnards at Site 2 have asked that all of them, or none, be resettled.

° Approximately 7,000 Cambodians who had entered Khao I Dang camp in Thailand illegally, but were issued temporary ration cards in October, have been moved from Khao I Dang proper to Site 7, or Bang Pu. Site 7 was emptied when some 55,000 Cambodians were moved to Site 2 late in 1985. The 7,000 now at Site 7, formerly referred to as "illegal" or "undocumented," are now being referred to as "ration card holders." They are currently ineligible for refugee status and resettlement, though sources there say as many as one-third of them have some U.S. connection.

Still in Khao I Dang are some 4,300 "food card holders," also currently ineligible for resettlement, and 16,000 registered Cambodian refugees. The U.S. review of Khao I Dang cases rejected for resettlement is continuing, but no preliminary results have been released. More than 600 cases are being reviewed.

° Paul D. Wolfowitz, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs has been named by President Reagan to be the new ambassador to Indonesia. Wolfowitz has been deeply involved in Southeast Asian refugee issues since his appointment in 1982. He will succeed John Holdridge in Jakarta.

Wolfowitz's successor as assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs will be Gaston Sigur, a consultant on East Asian affairs to the National

Security Council. Sigur, whose background is mainly in Japanese affairs, is also director of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies at George Washington University in Washington, D.C.

° The moratorium on the processing of refugees in the Sudan for third country resettlement continues, but the expulsions of the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM) and the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC), announced by the Sudanese government shortly after it imposed the moratorium in November, have, in effect, been set aside. According to the State Department and ICM officials, ICM was recently allowed to reoccupy its offices in the Sudan. An ICMC source said that organization has been renegotiating its contract with the Sudanese government, which suspended indefinitely its request for ICMC to leave.

The implications of these changes for any possible resumption of refugee processing in the country are unclear. The moratorium is apparently linked, as were the expulsions, to the trial of former officials of the overthrown government for their alleged involvement in the secret airlift of Ethiopian Jews from the Sudan to Israel via Europe. The trial has been going on for more than 100 days.

Recent Developments

DEFICIT-REDUCTION LAW CUTS INTO REFUGEE PROGRAM

Recent efforts to reduce the federal deficit will have both immediate and long-term impact on refugee admissions and provision of services to refugees.

Under the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction law (PL 99-177), spending must be cut by $11.7 billion this year, and far deeper cuts are anticipated starting in October, the beginning of the new fiscal year.

Under provisions of the law, automatic, across-the-board cuts of 4.3 percent in eligible nondefense programs will go into effect March 1 unless Congress and President Reagan agree to an alternative plan before that time. The chances of their reaching such agreement are considered remote. Most services related to refugees would be subject to the 4.3 percent cut. Eligible defense programs will be cut 4.9 percent.

State Department Anticipates Cuts in Refugee Program Applied to the Bureau for Refugee Programs (BRP) budget, the 4.3 percent reduction means cutting $14.6 million. A BRP source said it is not safe to assume that the 4.3 percent is being applied specifically to each account across the board, as the bureau has certain fixed costs. "Our first course of action will be to look for cost-saving measures that don't penalize the individuals we serve," said the State Department source. "Apart from that, we will try to make sure that what we do doesn't endanger human life anywhere."

If one applied the 4.3 percent formula for budget reductions to the FY 86 refugee admissions ceiling, currently 67,000, the result would be a cut of 2,881 places--in effect, creating a new ceiling of about 64,000. The BRP source said, however, that such an estimate would be highly speculative, since fixed costs apply to the admissions program as well. Another source at BRP said that any admisssions cuts would be divided equally between Southeast Asia and the other regions.

Other Federal Agencies Consider Impact of Cuts The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) faces an $18.4 million cut. Sources at ORR said they believed cuts there would be made across the board. The budget for all of HHS must be cut $1 billion this year.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) budget will be cut by $25.5 million this year. An INS spokesperson said that INS would attempt to apply the cuts with minimal effect on operational programs by reducing administrative costs and cutting back on travel and conferences. The Justice Department, of which INS is a part, faces cuts of $143 million this year.

A reluctance to talk about anticipated cuts characterized officials in most federal agencies. One factor contributing to the reticence is a pending court case challenging the constitutionality of the law. One administration source commented, "Bureaucrats prefer not to reveal cuts if there is a chance that the courts will reverse

them; that would leave agencies exposed by implying that certain areas of their programs could be open to cuts."

Plan Would Eliminate Deficit by FY 1991
The unique feature of the Gramm-Rudman measure is the process of "sequestration," by which cuts would automatically take place if Congress and the president fail to agree on other approaches to meeting specific budget deficit reduction targets. The annual year-end maximum deficit levels specified by the law are as follows:

FY 86: $171.9 billion
FY 87: $144 billion
FY 88: $108 billion
FY 89: $72 billion
FY 90: $36 billion
FY 91: zero

Drastic Cuts Expected for FY 87 Although there is general agreement in Washington that the cuts for FY 86 will be relatively manageable, Congressional and administration budget analysts alike expect massive cuts to start in October, the beginning of FY 87. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) are predicting a budget deficit at the close of FY 86 of nearly $220 billion, if no further action is taken to reduce it. Assuming that 11.7 billion will be cut from that figure, a year-end deficit of nearly $210 billion will remain. Meeting the Gramm-Rudman mandated reduction of $144 billion for FY 87, therefore, would require cuts of about $64 billion--five to six times the budget cuts going into effect this year.

President Reagan is expected to submit his FY 87 budget to Congress on February 3. The president has promised to continue his military buildup, but not to make cuts in Social Security or raise taxes. This suggests that his FY 87 budget will cut deeply into domestic programs that have already been subject to the Reagan administration 1981 spending cuts and to the FY 86 Gramm-Rudman cuts as well. Reagan's FY 87 budget is almost certain to call for the wholesale elimination of certain programs such as the Small Business Administration.

If the president and Congress are unable to agree on a budget reduction plan, the sequestration process would go into effect. Although termed an "across-the-board" cut, many programs would be exempt, including many costly federal budget items such as contracts for weapons systems. Also shielded from the cuts would be Social Security and selected programs for low-income people, including Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Medicaid.

Of total projected FY 86 spending of $996.5 billion, only $350 billion, or 35 percent, will be subject to sequestration. An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor observed, "An 'across-the-board' cut can hardly be as evenhanded as it sounds when two-thirds of the budget is off the table."

WOULD-BE ROMANIAN EMIGRANTS FACE HARDSHIPS

Secretary of State George P. Shultz's Dec. 15 visit to Bucharest focused debate on Romanian human rights and emigration policies and on whether the United States should continue most-favored-nation status to the eastern bloc country.

The talks with Romanian President Ceausescu were described by Shultz as "frank and candid," diplomatic shorthand for expressions of divergent views. Shultz indicated that differences over human rights were obstructing the U.S. desire for "a better relationship."

In the meantime, efforts were underway in Congress to repeal Romania's most-favored-nation (MFN) status because of its human rights record. MFN status allows countries to export goods to the United States with favorable tariffs. It paved the way for $1.2 billion in trade with Romania in 1984, with the balance heavily in Romania's favor.

Currently, bills are pending in both the House and Senate (H.R. 3599 and S. 1817) to suspend Romanian MFN status for six months before reviewing a renewal of the relationship. The president is expected to make a recommendation on MFN status on June 30 to be followed by a 60-day period for Congressional scrutiny.

"It is clear from the fact that our top diplomat chose to visit, that this is a serious concern," said Darren Trigonoplos, an aide to Sen. Paul S. Trible, Jr. (R-Va.), one of the bill's original sponsors in the Senate. He told Refugee Reports of efforts to hold hearings specifically on Romania

before the Foreign Relations Committee early in the year.

On May 14, 1985, hearings were held on Romanian human rights before the House subcommittees on Europe and the Middle East and on Human Rights and International Organizations. Rep. Gus Yatron (D-Pa.), who chaired the hearings, opened them by saying, "Those of us who try to help Romanians seeking to emigrate are aware of the serious procedural problems in Romania's emigration system.... Romanians who dare to apply for exit visas are often subjected to government harassment, as well as economic and social deprivation. These repressive measures may include demotion and expulsion from a place of work, forced retirements, false allegations and arrests, and monitoring correspondence and telephones."

Rights Monitors Note Persecution of Emigration Seekers "The only grounds for emigration are cases of family reunification," testified Jeri Laber, executive director of the U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee. "Despite this," she said, "there are thousands of requests to emigrate, and the movement to emigrate remains the only large-scale independent activity that the authorities in Romania seem unable to halt."

Laber stated that would-be emigrants face reprisals, harassment, denunciation, demotion, loss of job, loss of housing, loss of public services, and sometimes even arrest. In addition, she added, "Would-be emigrants must sell their real property at fixed, lower government rates, and they are not permitted to take funds out of the country. Family members left behind are harassed as well."

Testifying on behalf of Amnesty International, which monitors political imprisonment, Robert Sharlet said, "A large percentage of the cases currently on Amnesty's books arises from situations in which Romanian citizens are attempting or attempt to emigrate."

Helsinki Watch Report Documents Human Rights Abuses In July 1985, Helsinki Watch published a major report, Bleak Reality: Human Rights in Romania, which documented extensive human rights abuses and a pattern of persecution of certain religious and ethnic minorities. The report stated that "Romania is one of the most egregious offenders of human rights in Eastern Europe."

The report also is an indication of the growing movement to suspend most-favored-nation status for Romania. In the May hearings, Helsinki Watch had advocated not terminating MFN. With the release of the July report, however, Helsinki Watch switched positions, saying that past threats to withhold MFN status only resulted in "manipulation and deception by the Romanian government" and urged that "MFN tariff status for Romania be revoked altogether."

Helsinki Watch pointed out that the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the 1974 Trade Act directly linked MFN to countries' emigration policies. Helsinki Watch maintains that "the government's persecution and harassment of prospective emigrants is itself in violation of Jackson-Vanik, which states that MFN recipients cannot deny their 'citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate.'"

The report also notes that according to Jackson-Vanik, "countries that prevent emigration or tax their emigrants more than a 'nominal sum' do not qualify for MFN."

Officials' Demands for Bribes from Would-be Emigrants Reported The Helsinki Watch report documents a pattern of bribes and money transactions in return for exit papers. The West German government, for example, has signed an agreement with Romania stipulating that Germany will pay 7,900 DM for each ethnic German allowed to immigrate to West Germany. Helsinki Watch cites reports that "ethnic Germans have also been forced to pay various go-betweens bribes for their exit papers, ranging from 4,000 DM for a child to 10,000 DM for an adult." A knowledgeable source told Refugee Reports that Israel makes similar per capita payments for Romanian Jews.

In 1982, Romania tried to impose an "education tax" by which all emigration applicants would have to repay the state for any education received beyond the compulsory level of ten years. Although the law is still on the books in Romania, the practice was discontinued following vigorous U.S. protests and threats to sever MFN status over the issue.

Nina Shea, program director of the International League for Human Rights, told Refugee Reports that government agents request bribes and unofficial payments of up

to $3,200 as a prerequisite for receiving permission to emigrate. Even though the education tax is no longer officially enforced, Shea said, "exacting individual bribes would amount to the same kind of obstacle to emigration that Jackson-Vanik is intended to prevent."

Dr. Ernest Gordon, president of CREED, the Christian Rescue Effort for the Emancipation of Dissidents, also said that the education tax is a de facto reality. Today, many Romanians seeking to acquire emigration papers must pay officials amounts equivalent to that of the tax. He said that there is so much corruption in Romania that there is not much the U.S. embassy there can do about the situation.

Romanian Emigration Numbers Relatively High Before Shultz's trip in December, State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb announced that "Romania's emigration performance has been better than most other East European countries or the Soviet Union." The State Department credits Romania for allowing more than 150,000 persons to emigrate since gaining MFN status in 1975.

Romania's Jewish population has been reduced by 90 percent since the close of World War II, due largely to emigration. The State Department notes that Romanian Jewish emigration exceeds that from the Soviet Union, which has a Jewish community 100 times as large. Since 1975, 95,000 ethnic Germans have departed for West Germany. The State Department observes that 21,284 Romanians were issued immigration visas by the United States, West Germany, and Israel in 1984, three times the number for 1975.

Helsinki Watch, though, contends that the numbers do not tell the whole story. "The number of people allowed to emigrate each year from Romania does not in any way indicate the number of people who wish to emigrate because of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights that are carried out by the government."

Shea said that the International League for Human Rights sponsors a Family Reunification Project which tracks Romanians seeking to emigrate. The Family Reunification Project list of 1,000 active cases is based on Romanians and their relatives who independently contact the League, and not on an official count. The list includes both people who have received visas from the Romanian authorities and are awaiting host-country resettlement as well as those who have been denied visas. "There are people on our list who have waited 10 and 20 years," said Shea. "Many are old pensioners who are not privy to state secrets. The refusal to let them out is irrational as well as illegal."

The great bulk of people on the Family Reunification Project list are seeking to immigrate to Germany, according to Shea.

Shea maintains that the Romanian government will respond on the emigration issue when presented with lists from groups that they believe have clout with the U.S. Congress. "They want desperately to keep MFN," said Shea, "and they want to look good on the emigration issue."

Shea believes, however, that the Romanian government does "play games" with the United States in order to maintain MFN, and that many human rights reforms are only "cosmetic." She recommends linking MFN to specific, obtainable human rights goals.

Romanian Processing to U.S. Rests on TCP Legacy A special arrangement for processing Romanian refugees to the United States was negotiated in 1978 as an outgrowth of Jackson-Vanik and MFN status. Under the terms of Third Country Processing (TCP), the U.S. embassy in Bucharest provided the Romanian government with a list of names the United States was willing to sponsor. Romania then chose those from the list who would receive exit visas. In practice, many Romanians approached the U.S. embassy asking to have their names added to the list. Most had obtained exit visas from the Romanian authorities before doing so.

A State Department source said that getting exit visas for people on the U.S. embassy's list is generally not a problem. He did note, however, problems with visa 93 cases--spouses or children of refugees who did not leave as a family unit under the third country processing program--but who violated local laws by crossing the Romanian border illegally before being granted U.S. asylum.

CREED's Gordon told Refugee Reports of the case of a young Seventh Day Adventist whose father and brother fled the country illegally. The young man, Dorel Catarama, is currently imprisoned on what Gordon maintains are false charges related to his

efforts to meet the demand for bribes to exit the country.

After having been told to pay $3,000 for his exit visa, he had his father and brother send the money from the United States. Catarama was charged with illegal possession of hard currency. According to Gordon, he never even saw the money.

Gordon believes Catarama is being persecuted not only because he is a member of one of the denominations not recognized by the state, but also as punishment for the earlier flight of his brother and father. The State Department testified at the May human rights hearings that officers of the U.S. embassy attended Catarama's trial.

Critics Say TCP Serves Refugees Less Than Others Former U.S. Ambassador to Romania, David P. Funderburk, told Refugee Reports that the TCP program, originally set up to provide an outlet for dissidents, came to be abused. "Almost anybody could come in," he said. "We didn't know whether people were bona fide immigrants or not or whether they were planted by the Romanian government." Funderburk said that "we probably got some spies and hard-core communists" from the TCP program. "There was no rhyme or reason to the exit visas." The only reason most came, said Funderburk, was for a better material life, not for freedom and democracy.

Although Funderburk said that the United States should continue to keep its doors open for deserving refugees, he believes that TCP circumvented U.S. immigration laws. He also criticized the program for "allowing Romania to get rid of its critics."

The Refugee Policy Group, in its report U.S. Refugee Admissions: Processing in Europe, found the TCP program to be "much criticized." Describing TCP as "something of an anomaly," it noted that the program provided "a special status for Romanians not shared by other Eastern Europeans." The report observed, "Nearly everyone agrees that the program does not serve as an effective channel for the admission of genuine refugees, but while some policy makers suggest improvements in the program, such as negotiating with the Romanian government to allow INS circuit riders to interview the prospective applicants, others argue to abandon the program at once."

Despite Suspension of TCP Program Registration, Backlog Persists The United States stopped accepting new registrants for TCP in 1982, but the backlog of cases awaiting U.S. resettlement continued into 1985. Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) raised the issue at April 17 hearings on the Refugee Act reauthorization before the House Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and International Law.

Frank said that the U.S. refugee admissions ceiling for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union was not adequate for admitting the accumulated backlog. Calling the regionwide ceiling "a disgrace," he expressed frustration that because of the self-imposed ceiling, the United States has not been able to take advantage of its success in getting Romania to let refugees leave.

Following the hearings, Frank and 21 of his colleagues sent a letter to James N. Purcell, Jr., director of the Bureau for Refugee Programs (BRP) at the State Department, calling upon BRP to approach Congress with a request for increased admissions numbers for Romania. "This is a case in which the United States has already processed the individuals into the refugee program," said the letter, "and the remaining obstacle to their entry is a self-imposed ceiling under U.S. law. This is clearly an embarrassment to our foreign policy, as well as a matter of urgent humanitarian concern."

Purcell responded by informing the members of Congress that, for FY 85, the State Department had reallocated 2,000 places from the ceiling for Latin America and the Caribbean to other regions. Of the 1,000 places moved to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 750 were assigned to the Romanian TCP program. "With these additional numbers," said Purcell, "almost all of the Romanian TCP applicants who have exit documents at this time will enter the United States during the current fiscal year."

Purcell added that Romania had agreed not to issue exit documents to persons seeking entry to the United States unless the U.S. embassy verifies their eligibility. "With this agreement," Purcell wrote, "we hope to be able to process the remaining persons registered for the program in an orderly manner, without such applicants having to wait long periods of time in Romania after losing their rights and

privileges because they obtained exit documents."

TCP Program Value Debated The decision to stop taking new registrants into the TCP program was made, according to Purcell's testimony, because "we found that this program was subject to a fair amount of abuse."

Andrei Calciu-Dumitreasa, son of Gheorghe Calciu, the Romanian orthodox priest who spent six years imprisoned and under house arrest and who was only permitted to leave in August 1985 following appeals on his behalf by members of Congress and threats by President Reagan to suspend MFN status, told Refugee Reports that "the dumping of outlaws was the mistake of the U.S. embassy, not the TCP program. They didn't investigate enough." Calciu maintains that more careful procedures need to be taken at the embassy level, but that the program itself is sound.

Though he advocates ending TCP altogether, Funderburk expressed views similar to Calciu's on the role of the embassy. Funderburk said that there was a need for better American linguists to determine deserving and qualified people for consideration. He also complained that the majority of people working in the U.S. embassy in Bucharest were Romanians, who, he said, could be assumed to report proceedings to the authorities.

State Department Continues Processing TCP Backlog Of the 4,513 Romanian refugees admitted to the United States in FY 85, 3,061 were TCP cases. According to a State Department source, the United States has basically processed the backlog of TCP cases with exit documents. Now, however, the United States is attempting to process about 3,200 people on the embassy's TCP list from before the August 27, 1982, cut-off date who did not have Romanian exit documents. "The procedure now is to call in those people and see if they are still interested in coming," he said.

The State Department initially had anticipated that it would be able to move 2,000 of the backlog this fiscal year, but in the first quarter only about 100 were processed because of unforeseen delays. "Our timing calculations had been based on the previous backlog of persons with exit documents," said the source, who added that he anticipated a "large drop-out rate from this population." He noted that many people's situations could have changed considerably since 1982.

Looking to the Future The phasing out of TCP processing leads some observers to believe that future admissions will be limited to family reunification and a few other exceptional cases. Janet Fleischman, author of the Helsinki Watch report on Romania, told Refugee Reports, "Trying to make emigration from Romania more regular and standard will reduce emigration to a trickle." Once the TCP backlog is processed by the end of FY 87, she said, there will likely be a tightening of procedures for would-be emigrants. "The full effects won't be felt until FY 88," Fleischman said.

SANCTUARY TRIAL PROCEEDS SLOWLY

The "sanctuary" trial in Tucson, Arizona, which began on October 22, 1985, and was expected to last six weeks, ended its twelfth week on January 17 with only 2 of the government's projected 24 witnesses having been called.

The trial is seen as the first serious legal challenge to the sanctuary movement, which claims a membership of at least 250 churches and synagogues nationwide.

Eleven defendants, all clergy and church members of various denominations, are charged with 44 counts of smuggling and conspiracy to smuggle illegal aliens from Central America into the United States. Some counts carry a maximum penalty of five years and $10,000 in fines.

According to courtroom observers, the trial has not been without heated debate. Defense and prosecution attorneys have argued from the outset about the admissibility of evidence, and the defense has moved three times that the judge remove himself from the case.

Government Witnesses Testify Sources present at the trial report that the government's first two witnesses, Jesus Cruz and Alejandro Rodriguez (not his real name), testified they were present when some members of the Tucson group encouraged Central Americans to enter the United States illegally.

The testimony of Cruz was challenged by the defense, courtroom sources report, because he was employed by the government to infiltrate the group and inform INS about its activities. According to news reports, Cruz became an informant because he had been convicted of smuggling aliens into the United States and feared he would be deported to Mexico if he did not agree to the government's offer. He testified for 22 days.

Cruz, one of two informants the government used in its investigation, is alleged to have secretly taped more than 100 hours of sanctuary meetings, tapes which the prosecution decided not to enter as evidence over the objections of the defense.

Issue of Admissibility Raised Rodriguez, like the other nine or ten Central Americans the government may call to the stand, was offered immunity from prosecution. According to courtroom sources, his testimony once again raised the issue of admissible evidence--an issue first breached during defense counsel's opening remarks.

During cross-examination, Rodriguez reportedly said that, because he was a union leader in El Salvador, he was beaten and harassed by the Salvadoran military. When prosecutor Donald M. Reno, Jr., special attorney for the INS, objected to this line of testimony, his objection was upheld by presiding U.S. District Court Judge Earl H. Carroll. Carroll has ruled out several lines of testimony, including allegations of torture, beatings, and harassment. He has, though, allowed general descriptions of the political climate in Central America to be entered into the record. Early in the trial, he also ruled out evidence relating to the professed religious motives of the defendants, a ruling conceded by the defense to be a setback to their efforts.

Sources present at the trial report that the judge and the defense team have disagreed frequently on admissibility and other issues. During Rodriguez's testimony, which the prosecution found evasive, sources report that the judge said, "I think people from Latin America, perhaps, have a difficulty in just answering 'yes' or 'no', by nature of their personal attitudes." The defense later moved that the judge disqualify himself from the case because of bias against some of the defendants, a few of whom are Latin Americans. The judge denied the motion.

Churches File Suit against INS In a related development, the American Lutheran Church, the Presbyterian Church, and four of their churches in Arizona have filed suit in federal court in Phoenix charging INS with violating the First Amendment of the Constitution and its own policies while investigating the Tucson group.

The suit accuses Cruz and another paid informant of clandestinely tape-recording several weekly Bible-study sessions in July 1984 and a worship service in October 1984. The suit seeks to enjoin the government from further such activity and asks for a "declaratory judgment" stating that the investigative practices used by INS were improper.

INS officials will not comment on this suit or the Tucson trial, having been instructed by the judge to avoid public statements. According to an October 22, 1985 Washington Post article, the judge has already ruled that INS evidence-gathering practices in the case were not illegal, calling the practices "unacceptable but not outrageous."

Original Indictment Named 16 The sanctuary movement began in Tucson in 1982 when Reverend John Fife wrote a letter to then-Attorney General William French Smith indicating that his congregation, the Southside Presbyterian Church, intended to provide shelter to aliens from El Salvador. The INS investigation began in March 1984 and took nine to ten months. Indictments were handed down in January 1985.

A Washington Post article of October 25, 1985 reported that, originally, 16 defendants were named in the indictment. All were offered a plea bargain from the government, whereby jail time could be avoided in exchange for pleading guilty to a misdemeanor charge of failing to report an alien. Three people accepted the offer. Charges were dropped against two others, one for an apparent lack of evidence, and one because the accused is terminally ill.

The trial is expected to last until April. Defense attorneys say they will appeal any adverse verdicts.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SEEKS GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Local school districts will have greater flexibility to design federally funded programs for students with limited English skills, according to new regulations proposed by the Department of Education. The final regulations are due in early April.

At issue over the course of several months preceding publication of the regulations was the extent to which they would include native language instruction. In the Bilingual Education Act as amended in 1984 (Public Law 98-511), Congress limited spending on "alternative instructional programs" that use non-native language approaches, such as English-as-a-second-language (ESL). The law sets a 4 percent cap for alternative instruction on the first $140 million of funding and a 50 percent cap thereafter, with a maximum limit of 10 percent on total appropriations.

This Congressional commitment to native language instruction stemmed in part from the 1974 Supreme Court decision in Lau v. Nichols that schools must offer limited-English students some special instruction. When Congress reauthorized the Bilingual Education Act in 1974, it prescribed native language instruction as the sole approved method for limited-English students in federally funded local school districts.

Education Secretary Criticizes Bilingual Ed Program Secretary of Education William J. Bennett has been opposed to the four percent cap. With the release of the proposed regulations, Bennett announced, "The bilingual education program has been encumbered by self-defeating legislative and regulatory restrictions on instructional methods, and its once-clear purpose has become clouded by extraneous political considerations that have nothing whatsoever to do with helping children to learn English or to succeed in the mainstream of American life."

In an earlier speech in September, Bennett voiced his dissatisfaction with the evolution of the bilingual education program. He quoted the Lau v. Nichols decision: "No specific remedy is urged upon us. Teaching English to students of Chinese ancestry is one choice. Giving instruction to this group in Chinese is another. There may be others."

Bennett charged that the federal government ignored the Supreme Court's endorsement of a flexible approach in its pursuit of one method of instruction. "After seventeen years of federal involvement," he said, "and after $1.7 billion of federal funding, we have no evidence that the children whom we sought to help...have benefited."

The September speech was met by strong reactions both supporting and opposing Bennett's charges and proposals. A Christian Science Monitor editorial asked, "Is there really 'no evidence' of bilingual education's benefits?" and said, "For the first and second graders from non-English speaking families, who make up the bulk of bilingual ed students, who within a few years move into an all-English track, it may prove hard to see the benefits of Mr. Bennett's philosophical, ideological, and political broadside on the instruction they receive."

In a letter to the New York Times following Bennett's speech, but before the proposed regulations were published, Rep. Robert Garcia (D-N.Y.) wrote, "Eliminating the cap would be the first step toward eliminating bilingual education programs." He added, "I hope Secretary Bennett does not attempt to circumvent the will of Congress by instituting regulations that would effectively alter the intent of the act."

New Regulations Emphasize Flexibility The proposed regulations tell local educational agencies that they have "substantial discretion to determine the extent of native language use in transitional bilingual education programs." The regulations call for "maximum flexibility" in the implementation of projects and include a specific invitation from Bennett for comments on ways to achieve greater flexibility within the bounds of the statute. While the regulations do affirm that some native language instruction is legally required, they note, "The statute does not prescribe the minimum amount of time or instruction required to meet this standard."

In a statement introducing the regulations, Bennett said, "We still believe... that legislative action is needed to eliminate the four percent cap on the funding of special alternative instructional programs that severely constrains local flexibility." He said that the Education Department will

continue to work with Congress to introduce legislation in this regard.

Bennett reiterated the administration's commitment to programs for minority language students. "We will not seek cuts in bilingual education funds," he said. "If Congress consents to increased flexibility in the program, we will ask for more funds."

New Regulations Reflect Changing Times The Director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) in the Department of Education, Carol Pendas Whitten, told Refugee Reports that the proposed reforms in bilingual education are a consequence of changing immigration patterns.

The limited-English student population is no longer homogeneous, but represents a variety of national, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds and needs. "The 1974 call for one method of instruction came in response to a specific Hispanic lobby," she said. Those regulations presupposed the availability of professionals to teach in the students' native language.

Today, however, Whitten maintains, the traditional bilingual approach does not serve the needs of such diverse students. She related seeing Southeast Asian refugee children in Spanish-language classrooms. She asked, "Did boat people risk their lives so their children could learn English from Spanish?"

Other Instructional Approaches Suggested Whitten described several innovative models that have been funded within the four percent allowable for alternative programs. "The choice is not between native language instruction or 'sink or swim,'" she said. She pointed to immersion programs in Texas, Florida, New Jersey, and California which the department is studying. Immersion is a structured approach, according to Whitten, in which instruction is in English, but which takes into account how language is used and makes provisions for non-English inquiries from students.

Whitten said that all non-Hispanic immigrant groups prefer an approach emphasizing alternatives such as immersion or ESL instruction over the native language instruction approach. In fact, she pointed out that her office received 103 proposals for funding for alternative programs, as opposed to 311 for the other 96 percent of funding in transitional bilingual education.

The main issue, however, according to Whitten, is who decides on the appropriate curriculum. "Should the federal government dictate the instructional method or should parents and teachers be able to decide the best approach for their locality?"

Attitudes Towards Bilingual Education Surveyed In a California Institute of Technology study, which will be released in March, Bruce E. Cairn and D. Roderick Kiewiet surveyed black, white, Hispanic, and Asian opinions on a variety of social and political issues. Asked to indicate whether they favor the proposition: "Bilingual education programs. In other words, teaching non-English speaking students in their own language as well as English," the survey found enthusiastic support among Latinos, but only lukewarm support from Asians. While 69 percent of Latinos favored bilingual education programs, only a slight majority of 51 percent of Asians supported them. "Surprisingly," the researchers noted, "blacks were the closest allies [to Latinos] on bilingual education." Cairn and Kiewiet mused, "Why would Asians be less supportive of bilingual programs and blacks more supportive?" The question, the Cal Tech team concluded, demands further study.

Resource Centers Focus Training on ESL Included as a component of the bilingual education program are 16 regional resource and support centers to assist school districts in training their staffs in approaches to bilingual education.

According to Minerva Coyne, director of the Midwest Bilingual Education Multifunctional Resource Center, training sessions have become "strictly an ESL approach." She said that workshops include sessions on cultural sensitivity, but that "95 percent of our workshops deal with how to diagnose and place children in terms of English proficiency and teaching ESL."

She said that the Southeast Asian parents in her area only want ESL instruction and that "80 percent of parents at first didn't want bilingual education at all."

Others See Continuing Need for Southeast Asian Native Language Instruction Some voices in the Asian community, however, have

lamented what is perceived as a lack of attention for bilingual programs for Asian students. "The materials now available in Southeast Asian languages are far from adequate," said Dr. Mieko Han, director for seven years of the National Asian Center for Bilingual Education. "Earlier, when there were more funds," said Han, "school districts faced the problem more sincerely. But now the attitude has changed. It is sink or swim." Federal funding ended for her center two years ago. Now the center functions on a voluntary basis with people donating time to translate materials into Southeast Asian languages. "What can you do under this government's policies?" she asks. "People go where the money is."

In Pennsylvania, in a throwback to the period of Lau v. Nichols, a Cambodian teenager has sued the Philadelphia School District for placing him in a class for mentally retarded children and for failing to provide native language instruction or adequate English instruction. His lawyer contends that the 16-year-old boy was administered an English-language intelligence test designed for American children and that the boys' non-English-speaking parents signed an English consent form to place him in the mentally retarded class.

The class-action suit alleges that the Cambodian boy and 5,000 other Asian students in the Philadelphia school district are systematically denied their educational rights. The suit calls for bilingual instruction in native languages, and special education and testing in native languages or with interpreters.

Some Federal Funds Earmarked for Immigrant and Refugee Children Although critics point out that refugees are often overlooked in bilingual education programs, the federal government has committed funds for state-administered programs to meet the educational needs of immigrant and refugee children.

Although the administration has never requested money for emergency immigrant aid--a program to assist state and local educational agencies in providing specialized services, including bilingual education, for immigrant children--Congress has continued to appropriate funds for three years running. Jonathan Chang, program officer for this program and for transitional programs for refugee children, told Refugee Reports that the $30 million appropriated for FY 85 emergency immigrant aid was dispersed according to a formula based on the number of immigrant children per state.

A similar formula governs grants for the $16.6 million appropriated in FY 85 for transitional programs for refugee children. This program funds a variety of educational programs for refugee children, including bilingual education, remedial programs, services to improve English language skills, and summer educational programs.

Although also administered through OBEMLA, funding for refugee children comes through the Department of Health and Human Services, rather than the Department of Education. Therefore, the program is not constrained by the four percent cap on Education-funded programs.

Chang said the way funds are spent for transitional programs for refugee children has been left to local educational agencies and that the results of the refugee program are "not disappointing." He said that most states prefer stressing ESL and that children generally are "mainstreamed" after three years. Chang has been particularly impressed by his visits to newcomer centers (see Refugee Reports, Vol. VI, No. 10). "If you put all the kids with different language backgrounds together," he said, "the environment forces them to learn English to communicate with each other."

When asked how cuts arising from the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction law might affect bilingual education in general and programs for immigrant and refugee children in particular, an administration budget analyst remarked that the Department of Education is genuinely committed to bilingual education, but that "it would be logical to assume that emergency immigrant aid would not be a high priority, since we didn't request it in the first place."

Meetings and Conferences

° The Center for Migration Studies (CMS) will sponsor its Ninth Annual National Legal Conference on Immigration and Refugee Policy in Washington, D.C. on March 20-21. The conference will include the following sessions: Immigration Reform and Temporary

Guest Workers; Supreme Court and Immigration; The Private Sector, Immigration, and Refugees; Comparative Policies on Political Asylum in Europe and North America; Detention Issues; and Legal Aspects of the Sanctuary Movement.

The conference fees, for registration before February 26, 1986, are $150 for individuals, $90 for each member of government and nonprofit agencies and university faculties, and $45 for students. After February 26, the fees are $170, $105, and $55, respectively. For information, contact CMS, 209 Flagg Place, Staten Island, N.Y. 10304.

° The Fourth Conference on Refugee Health, sponsored by the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), School of Medicine and the UCSD Medical Center, will be held in San Diego March 6-7. The organizers recommend the conference for physicians, nurses, allied health professionals, and refugee health workers. Topics to be discussed include epidemiology, public health, mental health, reproductive medicine, infectious disease, and cross-cultural health care delivery. A special panel on federal leadership and mental health will feature staff of the National Institute of Mental Health. In addition, lectures and abstracts of original research on refugee health policy, the economic, cultural, and psychological adaptation of Indochinese refugees, and other health issues will be presented.

The conference fees are $85 for physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals, $65 for conference presenters of original research. For information, telephone Shirley Kolkey at (619) 294-5339, or write to Medicine, Education, and Research Foundation, Fourth Conference on Refugee Health, UCSD, P.O. Box 81344, San Diego, CA 92138.

° "The New Asylum Seekers" will be the topic of the Ninth Sokol Colloquium on International Law to be held at the University of Virginia, April 4-5. Papers will be presented on irregular movements of asylum seekers, first asylum and "refugees in orbit," the sanctuary movement, addressing root causes of refugee flows, and the principle of nonrefoulement as applied to situations of armed conflict.

Registration cost (before March 28) is $25 ($45 for those attending the Friday evening banquet). For further information, contact Ms. Danielle Cormier, Coordinator, Sokol Colloquium, University of Virginia School of Law, Charlottesville, VA 22901 (804) 924-7077.

Resources

U.S. REFUGEE ADMISSIONS POLICIES EXAMINED

Current U.S. resettlement mechanisms for admitting masses of refugees in a crisis are inadequate and impractical, according to a new study by the Refugee Policy Group (RPG).

The September 1985 report, Of Special Humanitarian Concern: U.S. Refugee Admissions Since Passage of the Refugee Act, recommends creating a special humanitarian admissions program to manage more effectively situations involving large numbers of people in need of protection, who may not have strong individual claims for refugee status.

The authors recommend that the clause found in the Refugee Act of 1980--"of special humanitarian concern to the United States"--be interpreted "to emphasize the admission of refugees who are most in need of the protection that admission to the United States can afford."

RPG criticizes the current policy that uses nationality, former connections to the U.S., and family reunification as the overriding factors in defining which refugees are of special concern to the United States.

"In many instances," the report notes, "more emphasis is given to determining whether someone fits one of the priorities [such as close ties to the United States through family or previous employment] than to determining whether the applicant has a compelling claim to refugee status or needs the protection resettlement affords."

While applauding the Refugee Act for dropping geographic and ideological restrictions on refugee admissions, the authors state that little evidence was found "that removing these limitations has led to more equitable access to the refugee admissions program for those from non-Communist countries or from countries whose governments are considered friendly to the foreign policy interests of the United States."

The 79-page study is available for $5.75 from the Refugee Policy Group, 1424 16th St., NW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20036.

Statistics

INDOCHINESE REFUGEE ACTIVITY
FY 86 as of November 30, 1985

COUNTRIES OF ASYLUM/RPC's	OCT. 1, 1985 POPULATION	FY 86 ARRIVALS	FY 86 REDUCTIONS TO U.S.	FY 86 REDUCTIONS 3RD COUNTRIES	FY 86 REDUCTIONS VOL. REPATR.	FY 86 REDUCTIONS OTHER	TRANSFER TO RPCs	NOVEMBER 30, 1985 POPULATION
HONG KONG	10,039	153	9	350	0	4	247	9,577
MACAO	692	4	0	0	0	0	3	693
INDONESIA	7,048	865	95	488	0	0	653	6,575
MALAYSIA	8,296	1,394	130	522	0	3	560	8,464
PHILIPPINES	3,184	196	30	288	0	0	17	3,041
SINGAPORE	260	248	24	105	0	0	101	550
THAILAND	4,618	430	69	329	0	0	171	4,492
OTHER	1,331	129	0	86	0	0	7	1,366
TOTAL BOAT	35,468	3,421	357	2,168	0	7	1,759	34,758
THAILAND - KHMER	24,786	0	6	1,678	0	33	340	22,902
THAILAND - HIGHLANDERS	54,666	111	18	33	0	0	585	54,916
THAILAND - LAO	36,997	350	26	205	0	0	812	36,486
THAILAND - VIETNAMESE	529	33	5	79	0	0	0	493
TOTAL LAND	116,998	494	55	1,955	0	33	1,737	114,797
TOTAL DIRECT (ODP)	282	4,057	193	1,962	0	0	1,408	377
SUBTOTAL	152,748	7,972	605	6,085	0	40	4,904	149,932
BATAAN-RPC	15,333	3,372	4,231	55	0	4	0	14,320
GALANG-RPC	2,013	667	1,200	1	0	0	0	1,967
PHANAT NIKHOM ESL/CO	5,495	962	1,348	0	0	42	0	5,067
TOTAL RPCs	22,841	5,001	6,779	56	0	46	0	21,354
GRAND TOTAL	175,589	7,972	7,384	6,141	0	86	4,904	171,286

The end-of-month population figure is provided by UNHCR, and is the result of ongoing updating and adjusting of statistics. Therefore, the end-of-month population figure is not the result of a horizontal calculation based on arrivals and reductions. Admissions to the United States include those persons entering the United States in refugee status.

Source: U.S. Department of State, Bureau for Refugee Programs.

Editorial comments and inquiries should be sent to: *Refugee Reports*, 815 Fifteenth Street NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20005. All communications regarding subscriptions should be addressed to: Refugee Reports Subscriptions, Sunbelt Fulfillment Services, P.O. Box 41094, Nashville, TN 37204. (615) 377-3322.

Basic subscription rate for 12 issues per year: $28.00; Multiple-copy rate: $20.00; Single copies of back issues: $2.50. Managing Editor: Virginia Hamilton; Editor: James Silk; Writer/Researcher: Bill Frelick; Staff Writer: Gary Young; Production Coordinator: Koula Papanicolas.

© 1986 American Council for Nationalities Service. Rights of reproduction and redistribution reserved. ISSN 0884-3554.

Refugee Reports

A Project of the American Council for Nationalities Service
Sunbelt Fulfillment Services
P.O. Box 41094
Nashville, TN 37204

FIRST CLASS

FIRST CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
NASHVILLE, TN.
Permit No. 349

Address Correction Requested
Return Postage Guaranteed